

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FINJAN, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
BITDEFENDER INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-04790-HSG](#) (MEJ)

DISCOVERY ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 61

Plaintiff Finjan, Inc. and Defendants Bitdefender, Inc. and Bitdefender S.R.L. (together, “Bitdefender”) filed a joint discovery letter regarding the terms of their proposed protective order and order regarding electronically stored information (“ESI”). Letter, Dkt. No. 61. Having reviewed the parties’ arguments, the record in this case, and the relevant legal authority, the Court **ORDERS** the following:

1. Patent Local Rule 2-2 Model Protective Order’s definition of “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE” shall govern.
2. Former employees of a party or competitor shall not serve as experts.
3. If the parties are unable to resolve any objections regarding who has access to the Source Code, they shall follow the procedures set forth in paragraph 2 of the undersigned’s Standing Order re: Discovery. No motions to compel will be considered.
4. Finjan may print up to 300 total pages of Bitdefender’s Source Code in up to 20-continuous-page increments.
5. Non-technical information may be designated as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY.”
6. Email production requests shall be limited to a total of 7 custodians per producing

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

party.

The parties shall submit a proposed protective order and order regarding ESI consistent with this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 5, 2018



MARIA-ELENA JAMES
United States Magistrate Judge